



A  
S E R M O N  
O N  
I N O C U L A T I O N , &c.



[Price TWO SHILLINGS]





4

*The Practice of Inoculation justified.*

---

A  
S E R M O N

PREACHED AT  
INGATESTONE, ESSEX, OCTOBER 12, 1766,

IN  
Defence of Inoculation.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,  
An A P P E N D I X  
ON THE  
PRESENT STATE of INOCULATION;  
With Observations, &c.

BY  
ROBERT HOULTON, M. A. *K*  
CHAPLAIN TO THE EARL OF ILCHESTER,  
AND OFFICIATING CLERGYMAN AT MR. SUTTON'S,

Published by General Request.

THE SIXTH EDITION.

\*\*\*\*\*

E S S E X:

Printed and Sold by LIONEL HASSALL, in Chelmsford

AND SOLD ALSO BY

R. DAVIS, in PICCADILLY; J. WILKIE, in ST.  
PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD; and J. KINGMAN,  
under the ROYAL EXCHANGE,  
LONDON.

The Practice of Inoculation justified.

A  
S E R M O N

PREACHED AT  
ROCHESTER, N.Y., OCTOBER 12, 1792.

IN  
Defence of Inoculation.

BY  
ALFRED DIX

PRESENT STATE OF INOCULATION

WITH OBSERVATIONS

BY  
ROBERT HOUTON, M.D.

AND ASSISTANT SURGEON OF THE STATE

Published by G. R. Roper.

THE NEW YORK

Printed and Sold by LEITCH, HENRY, in Church

Street, in New York, at the Sign of the  
Anchor, opposite the Court House.



T O

Mr. DANIEL SUTTON,  
SURGEON.

S I R,

**E**VER indebted will these king-  
doms be to the late honourable  
lady MARY WORTLEY MONTAGUE,  
mother of the present right hon-  
ourable countess of BUTE, for the  
great and noble blessing, Inocu-  
lation. Thousands of subjects,



the tender husband, the affectionate wife, fond parents and pious children engrave her name in deep characters on their hearts and will record it forever with gratitude and praise.

EQUALLY obliged, sir, is the nation to you. Your indefatigable attention to investigate the true, subtle, and abstruse nature of the Small-pox; the great, the surprisingly great improvements you have made on the practice of Inoculation, have rendered it a blessing indeed; and merited you the distinguished favour and applause of the public,

By these improvements the art justly becomes your own; an art that must and ought to transmit your name to posterity. And it is not to be doubted, but the time is hastily approaching, when the SUTTONIAN system or method of Inoculation will be universally adopted.

Here, sir, I seem to see the odious, ghastly sneers of the unskilful, the envious and ill-affected. But let me tell the wretches, they have no right to question the above truths, or to stigmatise me with the name of flatterer, until they have proved

themselves superior to you in experience, practice and success.

MANY base methods have been contrived to obstruct you ; but you have surmounted them all, and are now above the reach of prejudice and malice. You have the voice of the people, and above all the happiness to deserve it. --- These considerations, and the respect paid you by some of the first physicians in the kingdom should teach your contemptible snarlers to know your merit, and to know themselves.

Go on then, sir, and prosper.



May your present unfulfilled success always attend you. May you live many, many years to do good. May your art be ever crowned with an infinite recompence of reward to yourself and heirs; with joy and happiness to this nation in particular, and to mankind in general. Accept these sincerest wishes from him, who dedicates to you the following discourse on Inoculation, because he is convinced you best deserve it; and who is, Sir,

Your much obliged humble servant,

*Witham,*  
*March 10, 1767.*

ROBERT HOULTON.

DEDICATION

May your present unfulfilled fac-  
cess always attend you. May  
you live many, many years to  
do good. May your art be ever  
crowned with an infinite recom-  
pense of reward to yourself and  
hairs; with joy and happiness  
to this nation in particular; and  
to mankind in general. Accept  
these sincerest wishes from him  
who dedicates to you the fol-  
lowing discourse on inoculation,  
because he is convinced you will  
derive it; and who is, &c.

Your much obliged humble servant,  
ROBERT HARRISON

A

## LETTER to the CRITICAL REVIEWERS,

BY WAY OF

## P R E F A C E.

May it please your High Mightinesses ;

**I** Beg the favour, if you deign to take notice of the following discourse, that you will permit my printer and publisher to be stiled HASSALL; and not substitute another's name, much less that of any printer, who *steals* into the profession. For in a Review of last year, you make one Toft the publisher of three of my pieces, viz. a *Sermon on Detraction*, and two Pamphlets signed OXONIENSIS; neither of which he *printed or published*. — Had his name disgraced one of my pieces only, I should have readily concluded it was done through mistake; but being tacked to all of them, it manifestly discovered your *kind and partial* design; for which I cannot sufficiently admire your *modesty*.

AND I take the liberty to advise you to injoin your country puffers to be less communicative: for a certain *peddling* bookseller, at the time I published the above-mentioned pieces, boasted much of having an intimacy with one of your associates, named ROBINSON; and that he would do this and that; he should write to him, and would take care that my pieces had their proper character; because, I suppose, he (the bookseller) was not my printer, &c.



AND you too, Gentlemen, must resent my not employing him, at the expence of justice to my printer and publisher. — Surely this conduct will in time convince the public of your *boasted impartiality*. For if little country booksellers have that influence with you, to get what remarks they please, made on publications, because, forsooth, they are not employed by the authors, who can longer esteem the Critical Review? — For thus *presuming* to attack your High Mightinesses, I live in *dreadful apprehension* of your *sovereign contempt*, or of your *tremendous satire* and *invective*. — If you condescend to criticize, what think you of the following manner?

No. A *Sermon on Inoculation*, &c. Haffall. price 2s. We think (*viz.* one of our band thinks) the author should be inoculated with *Jon's distemper* for his pains, and the reader with his patience.

On suppose, you are witty on me thro' means of my text, as, *This Sickness, indeed, is not unto death*; but we prophesy the sermon won't live a week.

Or—but I leave it to you—you have doubtless witticisms and characters of all kinds for pieces that are to be published in seventy-seven, as well as sixty-seven.

I am, Gentlemen, with all *due* respect,

Your most sincere Admirer,

R. HOULTON.

Feb. 20. 1767.

P. S. ON recollection, it will certainly be thought, if you decry my sermon, that this letter ruffles your philosophy. The best way, therefore, is to take *no notice* of me, or to get the Monthly Reviewers (*viz. yourselves*, as the saying is) to trim my jacket.

W O R M I N G  
A  
S E R M O N  
O N  
I N O C U L A T I O N,

---

THIS SICKNESS IS NOT UNTO DEATH.

JOHN XI. 4.

**T**HESE words relate to LAZARUS that was raised from the dead ; for whom our blessed SAVIOUR seemed to have had a peculiar regard, as appears from the following message sent to inform him of his illness : *Lord, behold he whom thou lovest, is sick.* This tender message had its full effect on him, who while on earth went about doing good ; whose heart was ever open to pity, and affected at human woe ; whose ear listened to distress, and who felt for mankind. It determined him to rescue LAZARUS from death, and to afford comfort to his mournful sisters. — But he proposing also, on this occasion, to manifest the glory of GOD, as well as his own di-

A

vine power and mission, by a greater miracle than just a simple cure of his sickness, delayed his going till LAZARUS was dead.

OUR SAVIOUR'S stay for two days after the message and modest address of the sisters, may not seem, perhaps, consistent with a zealous regard for LAZARUS, or a real friendship for his sisters; as it made the former suffer even the pains of death, and kept the latter longer in suspense and grief; — but it shewed his perfect wisdom and goodness, as it made the wonderful work more remarkable and conducive to the conviction of the spectators. For had he gone before LAZARUS was dead, they might have attributed his recovery rather to the strength of nature than to any miraculous power: or had he raised him as soon as he was dead, they might have thought it rather some trance or extasy than a death or dissolution. But now to raise a person, four days dead, offensive and reduced to corruption, was a surprize of unutterable joy to his relations; removed all possible suspicion of confederacy; silenced peevish cavilling; and triumphed over the obstinacy of prejudice and infidelity.—There is something singularly great and pathetic in the whole account of this miracle, as recorded by the apostle. Joy, grief, and pity, are strongly painted: — the circumstances are tender, and the



wailings of MARTHA and MARY affecting; — they must be so, — for JESUS *wept*: — nay, his grief was so great and apparent, that the JEWS (who came to see the miracle) exclaimed, *behold how he loved him!* — In short, our SAVIOUR verified his words, *This sickness is not unto death*; — and as the verse goes on, *but for the glory of GOD, that the Son of GOD might be glorified thereby*, — by a most awful and wonderful miracle. — Thus much for the words I have chosen, as to their immediate sense. I shall now take the liberty to apply them to Inoculation\*, and, I hope, without incurring the censure of levity, or of wresting Scripture to defend an improper subject.

#### THIS SICKNESS IS NOT UNTO DEATH.

THE expression will bear a two-fold explanation. It may be used in a natural sense, to prove the Safety of Inoculation; that it endangers not life; and in a spiritual one, to justify the practice of it: — for *death* is threatened, in many places of Scripture, not as an immediate but as a future punishment for the transgression of GOD's commands; particularly in the second chapter of Genesis, *In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.*

---

\* For sake of brevity, I shall use the word Inoculation all along, to signify Inoculation of the Small-pox, agreeable to its present general acceptance.

Which implied not a natural but a spiritual death; alluding to the forfeiture of eternal life: a punishment threatened to deter ADAM from eating the forbidden fruit. So that my text, in regard to the present subject, may be thus very fairly paraphrased.

THIS sickness, as caused by Inoculation, is not unto death; that is, is not worthy of *divine vengeance or punishment*; because it *violates no command of God*, and is not *included under any sin that he has forbidden*.

THIS, it shall be my endeavour in the following discourse to evince; to remove the scruples of the conscientious, and to prove that the Practice of Inoculation is justifiable in the sight of God. — As for the natural or verbal sense of the text, the success of the practice, at least of the *present, principal* practice of Inoculation, so fully demonstrates it, that it almost amounts to a *self-evident truth*. Arguments, therefore, on this head, are useless and unnecessary; experimental proof is the best of arguments. All that is wanting is, to adapt some plain reasoning to the capacity and conviction of the too-scrupulous, and over-conscientious.

LET us first enquire, how far reason and experience enforce the Practice of Inoculation. But before this, let me make a remark on the term *itself*. Many, I

am apt to think, owe their prejudice to the practice, from the very sound of the word *Inoculation*; and make it convey such horrible ideas, as ought to exist only in a distempered brain. — I would ask, What does *Inoculation* mean more than *Self-preservation*? Or why may it not be defined still more mildly, and called, *an endeavour* (as it certainly is) *to preserve our lives*? I could almost dare to rest this cause on the answer that the most conscientious casuist would give to the following question: Whether, in cases of danger, it is displeasing to the ALMIGHTY to see his creatures endeavour *to preserve their lives*, if the means are inoffensive? The sophist might, perhaps, dispute the latter part of my question, and assert that the *means* are very offensive and injurious to society, as it spreads the infection to the destruction of mens lives; and in that light is displeasing to God. But this is arguing from the abuse of the thing, and is consequently of not the least force, as it does not refute that the *means* are inoffensive and justifiable, when kept within proper bounds. — But to proceed.

SELF-PRESERVATION has been long adjudged a standing maxim, an indispensable duty, the first and great law of nature. It is a principle ingrafted in our birth, and begins to act as soon as we begin to think, and to know danger. A principle that com-



mands the will, and is actuated more by instinct than reflection. — Agreeable to this principle, man naturally dreads every disorder or sickness that threatens his dissolution, and which he knows, is frequently unto death : and, as naturally strives to avoid it ; or, if involved in it, to subdue its malignant and dangerous effects. — The ravages of the small-pox, in all ages, conditions, and constitutions he daily hears of, accompanied with the most dismal and deplorable circumstances. Its spreading infection and fatality strike him with terror, and put him on his guard to secure his person from the contagion : but, alas ! repeated accounts alarm him, that his friends and neighbours, who took the same and greater precaution, are cut off by this destructive and tremendous plague. No one, he finds, is secure ; for infection rides on the wings of the wind, and the air is incorporated with malignant vapour. — Such a one perceives himself in imminent danger. — The contagion approaches him with hasty strides, and levels numbers of his fellow-creatures. He beholds himself in as dreadful a condition as the man who sees a rock of an immense size falling on him. If the latter has any reason left, in such circumstances ; if it is not overpowered with fear, he naturally springs from the dangerous spot, lest he

should be crushed to atoms. And if there is a way for the escape of the former, who believes destruction as near to him, reason instantly points it out, and hurries him on to preserve his life. — Will any, in their senses, assert, that it is folly and rashness, that it is wicked, absurd and unreasonable thus to accept in an imminent crisis, when death is impending, the proffered and certain means of security?

THE conscientious person must be cautious here of allowing, that Inoculation may be justifiable in some particular cases. For if the act is sinful in the sight of God, no case can alter the nature of that sin, or affect the decrees of the ALMIGHTY, which are immutable. Either the act must be pleasing or displeasing to God; not in some particular cases, but universally so. — But to pursue the dictates of reason and experience.

DOUBTLESS, then, we are influenced, or rather hurried on by reason to preserve our lives in all cases of danger: — and not by reason only, but by experience also; — for as reason points out the means of safety, so experience teaches the most proper use of those means. — With respect to our present subject, experience clearly demonstrates the danger, the fatality of the Small-pox, when received by natural infection; and as clearly evinces the efficacy and safety

## A SERMON

of inoculation; how much it tends to subdue the malignancy of the distemper, to secure our lives; and that the *sickness*, so contracted, *is not unto death*. — This is the means, this the way for our escape; reason directs us to it; experience proves the utility and safety. Men, by the light of PROVIDENCE, I'll presume to say, have discovered Inoculation, and brought it to the greatest Perfection; so great indeed, as to repel and subdue every dangerous symptom, and to have gained, (if I may so speak) the most complete victory over this dreadful enemy to life: — so that we may exult, and exclaim in the language of scripture, *we triumph over death*.

DEATH is thus banished, and life secured: on one hand, the danger is great; on the other, the fear of death vanishes, and a joyful certainty of life presents itself. Not to make a proper use of this blessing, is to sin against knowledge, to rebel against light; to act against reason, and to disregard experience, the best of wisdom. — But the conscientious will say, that *notwithstanding reason might suggest the means to preserve life, reason should be guided by revelation, and should direct the choice of no means but what are agreeable to the laws of religion and conscience. That the ALMIGHTY is LORD of life and death, and of all things to them pertaining; as health, strength, weakness and*



*sickness:—that the government and disposal of these belong entirely to him. Therefore to take the reins out of his hands must be wicked:—and moreover, Inoculation is a sin, because it shews a mistrust of the ALMIGHTY, as if he was unable to deliver us from death.*

—This, I think, is the grand moral objection to Inoculation, from which all others are derived, and which, I hope, the most scrupulous and conscientious will allow I have stated in its full force.—I shall, therefore, now examine into the truth and propriety of this objection, and see if it has strength sufficient to oppose and invalidate the arguments that are brought in defence of one of the greatest discoveries that was ever made for the benefit of mankind: which will shew, I hope, at the same time, what I have undertaken to endeavour to prove, viz. that *Inoculation is justifiable in the sight of God.*

THE former part of the objection seems to imply that the act of Inoculation, or in other words, an attempt to preserve life, (by slightly indisposing ourselves, thereby to escape the dreadful effects of a very dangerous and fatal distemper) opposes the revealed will of God, and offends some one part of the Holy Scriptures. I say, it seems to imply this;—for in fact the objection exists only in imagination. I would beg to be informed by these conscientious religionists,

what part of Scripture intimates, that reason thus dictates a choice of means to preserve life that are contrary to the revealed word of God, or true religion. If this act of self-preservation was attended with fatal consequences, the sixth commandment, perhaps, may be wrested to support their frivolous objections :—but as these seldom, or never happen, except through the ignorance of the Inoculator, or the imprudence of the Patient, the sin, if there is any, will arise not from the act itself, but from the presumption of the ignorant operator, or carelessness of the Patient, in neglecting to conform (as 'tis every one's duty in all states and circumstances to conform) to those rules and means, which tend to preserve life. — But as the scrupulous cannot pretend that this act, under any kind of similitude, is forbidden either directly or indirectly in Holy Writ, let them confess that their objections are founded on reasons merely conscientious, and we will then consider how far this opinionative conscience obliges them to oppose the practice of Inoculation.

CONSCIENCE can be under no obligation but to the laws of God and man. And since the law of God commanding or forbidding actions, is the only moral rule by which a man can judge what actions are duties, and what are sins ; it plainly follows,



that as a man cannot be *bound in conscience* to do any action, which it doth not appear that God has commanded and made a duty : so neither can it go *against a man's conscience*, to do any action which he is not convinced that God's law hath some way or other forbidden, and so made a sin. And therefore, in our present case, that man only can *justly plead conscience* against Inoculation, that can truly say, I am persuaded that this act is forbidden by some law of God.

Now as neither this act of self-preservation, nor any mode of it, is forbidden directly or indirectly by the law of God ; nor (as we will allow for the present) so commanded, the act becomes an indifferent thing. And all indifferent things may be done or omitted, according to the will of man : because, as St. PAUL says, *where no law is there is no transgression* ; and again, *sin is not imputed, where there is no law*. The same Apostle intimates, that where there is no law, the *conscience* becomes a *law* unto itself ; the *thoughts* of men *accusing*, or else *excusing* them. — I would ask here, what is this, but the voice of *reason* ? Surely, the Apostle means, that where there is no law to direct us, reason should be our guide. And, in fact, without a law, conscience and reason must be the same, and are of equal extent and signi-



fication. Therefore as all duties derive their obligation either from reason or revelation, and as I have sufficiently evinced, I flatter myself, that reason points out self-preservation, and obliges us, as it were, to study a way for our escape in all cases of danger; it will necessary follow, that conscience, in regard to Inoculation, should submit to reason, which convinces us of the justness and greatness of that blessing, that saves thousands of lives from an untimely grave, and gives strength and happiness to society.

It may, however, be objected, that according to ST. PAUL's doctrine of a *thing being unclean to him that believes it to be unclean*; that Inoculation would be a sin in those who believe it to be a sin, and cannot be convinced to the contrary. But this affects not the argument in general: because the question is, whether Inoculation is absolutely, and in itself, a sin. And God forbid that the mere opinions, and obstinate prejudices of an ignorant few, should make that a sin, which is not itself so. Such weak people are more to be pitied than their unreasonable scruples of conscience are to be regarded. For tho' ST. PAUL was willing to *bear*, as he expresses it, *with the infirmities of the weak Jews*, and not to force them to retract their obstinate error in believing that

several meats were unclean to them to eat, things of so little importance in themselves, yet so far was he from giving them room to believe their scruples of conscience were justly founded, that he tells them his own opinion of the matter, in the following emphatical manner: — *I know, and am persuaded by the Lord JESUS that there is nothing unclean of itself.*

NOTWITHSTANDING ST. PAUL thus forbore to censure those JEWS who entertained opinions of *things indifferent*, contrary to his own; and forbade the *strong in faith* to judge severely and uncharitably of them; unwilling, perhaps, to oppose and offend their obstinacy at a time when they were just converted to Christianity, he, doubtless concluded, in his private sentiments, they were endowed with a very poor share of understanding; and therefore bestowed pretty liberally on them, but in a mild and sensible manner, the term *weak*; that strong characteristic of ignorance.

Now, as the objections to that mode of self-preservation, expressed by Inoculation, are, *alike*, merely conscientious, (nay more so than the scruples of the converted JEWS concerning the uncleanness of some particular meats; a misapprehension of the Mosaic institution favouring their opinions) founded on no one part of scripture, no ways repugnant to the revealed will of GOD, let me again exclaim, shall the *weak*—



*ness*, the *infirmities* of an ignorant few be regarded? shall their ridiculous, *unreasonable*, and groundless scruples of conscience be judged sufficient to frustrate the most happy discovery, the most noble endeavour, or stop the progress of one of the greatest blessings ever vouchsafed to man?

It is scarce worth while to take notice here of an objection that was once made to the practice of Inoculation, founded, as asserted, on Scripture: but as some of my hearers may have heard the same, without prejudice, I dare say, in favour of it, I shall give the argument and answer. A conscientious person, or at least an affected one, observed, that Inoculation was condemned under the following piece of advice of ST. PAUL to the PHILIPPIANS; *be careful for nothing, but in every thing, by prayer and supplication, let your requests be made known unto GOD.* It was answered, That if ST. PAUL had even said; *be not careful of your life; use no means to keep and preserve it*, no argument could be drawn from hence against Inoculation: that such expressions must be understood in the same sense with those of our SAVIOUR, *take no thought for the morrow, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, or wherewithal ye shall be clothed*: which commands, none, in their senses, could suppose our blessed SAVIOUR enjoined men *literally*



to obey; but were meant to advise them to withdraw their affections from the world; that is, not to be so solicitous about the things of this life, as to make them forget the *one thing needful*, the salvation of their souls:—that in this sense ST. PAUL was to be understood; and therefore Inoculation, so far from indicating too great an affection or over-solicitousness for the things of this world, or even life itself, may always be embraced, for what the scrupulous prove to the contrary, and what is reasonable and charitable to suppose, in order to preserve life to the glory of God, and good of mankind.

EQUALLY weak and ridiculous are those arguments against Inoculation, which are built on the following passage of ST. PAUL:—*let him that standeth take heed lest he fall*. This advice was given by the Apostle to persuade the CORINTHIANS to adhere stedfastly to the christian religion; and to take especial care they were not tempted to idolatry. But allowing it can be wrested to signify an obligation to avoid sickness, or in other words not to expose or lessen our health, when we enjoy the greatest share of it; yet this passage may be brought as much, if not more, in defence of Inoculation, than against it. For, if the words must, I say, be wrested to allude to this subject, why may

not the favourers of Inoculation thus paraphrase them? We enjoy, at present, the most perfect health, but as the Small-pox, when received by natural infection, is generally attended with dreadful circumstances, and great danger to life, nay frequently, with the loss of; *let us though we think we stand, take heed lest we fall* by this fatal sickness: the sad effects of which, we cannot more prudently and securely guard against, than by embracing Inoculation; which, experience has demonstrated by numberless instances, subdues the power of the disorder, and banishes every symptom of danger.

HAVING thus advanced, and, I flatter myself, in some measure proved, that the mode of SELF-PRESERVATION, implied by Inoculation, is neither directly nor indirectly forbidden by *Revelation*, I shall endeavour further to shew the absurdity of the above general objection, and to evince that this action is *commanded* by the law of GOD. — For this purpose we are to observe, that by the *law of Scripture*, as it is the rule of conscience, we are not only to understand the express commands and prohibitions we meet with in the letter of the text, but all that by unavoidable consequence follow from those commands or prohibitions. In a word, when we are deliberating concerning the goodness or badness, the lawful-



ness or unlawfulness of this or that action ; we are not only to look upon the letter of the law, but to attend farther to what that law may be supposed by a rational man to contain. And if we be convinced that the action about which we deliberate is commanded or forbidden by direct inference, or by parity of reason, we ought to look upon it as a duty or a sin, though it be not expressly commanded nor forbidden by the law, in the letter of it. And if neither by the letter of the law, nor by consequence from it, nor by parity of reason, the action appears to be commanded or forbidden, in that case we are to look on it as an *indifferent action* ; which we may do or omit as before observed with a *safe conscience* : or to express the thing properly ; we may look upon it as an action in which our *conscience* is not so much concerned as our *prudence*.—Whatever, then, is commanded by God, the opposite sin is ever understood in that command to be forbidden ; and, under what is forbidden, the contrary duty is commanded and implied.—For example ; *thou shalt not steal* ; the contrary duty implied is, *thou shalt live honest* ; — *keep the sabbath day holy* ; the contrary forbidden is, *thou shalt not forget or prophane the sabbath* : --- *thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour* ; the contrary command is, *thou shalt speak the truth of*



thy neighbour. To come to the point; *thou shalt do no murder*: no murder means, no kind of murder, either on thyself or fellow-creature: what I insist upon, therefore, is, that according to the foregoing observations, by parity of reason, and by direct inference, the following duty is absolutely implied under the sixth commandment; --- *thou shalt use thy utmost endeavours to preserve thy life, and that of thy fellow-creatures.*

To this method of reasoning it might, perhaps, be objected; or agreeable to it, it may be said, that if a person dies under Inoculation, the party, and all who advised the action, are involved in the guilt of murder. But nothing would be more weak and absurd than such an objection; because the guilt of an action arises from the intention: or, in other words, the intention, with which an action is done, constitutes the degree of guilt or innocence; and by which it appears criminal or otherwise in the sight of the ALL WISE SEARCHER OF HEARTS. If the case was not so, a man who killed another by mere accident, would be equally guilty with him that murders from malice of heart: but this is too evident to dwell on.

It should be asked then, with what intent do we embrace Inoculation; — to save life or to destroy it?

—most assuredly to lengthen and preserve life. The intention is good therefore, and consequently as the action is neither forbidden directly nor indirectly, it may with confidence be asserted that the practice of Inoculation can be justified in the sight of GOD and conscience. Nay, it may be insisted that this act is not only justifiable but *pleasing* to the ALMIGHTY: for if self-murder be forbidden, and a crime heinous in the eyes of our CREATOR, we may certainly be allowed, on the contrary, to conclude it is agreeable to him to see his creatures strive to preserve their lives, and those of their families. In a word, to those, whose objections are built on obstinate and unreasonable prejudices, and groundless scruples of conscience, should the same question be put, which our blessed SAVIOUR proposed to the JEWS who condemned him for healing on the Sabbath-day; *is it lawful to do good, to save life or to destroy it?*

It may not only be advanced, that the act of Inoculation is tacitly commanded by the law of GOD, but that it is in itself an indispensable moral duty.—That every man is under an obligation to preserve and employ the life given him by his CREATOR, to the best of purposes, cannot be denied. Neither is any man to live to himself: all are bound to the LORD of the universe faithfully to discharge



their duties in their several stations, to the honour and glory of their CREATOR, and the good of their fellow-creatures. We are all instruments in God's hands, made to answer the particular ends of his Providence; —the parts allotted us at our birth, we are to perform with the utmost care through life; and, whatever the race be, to run it with patience, and resignation to the divine will. — On these considerations we are indispensably obliged studiously to maintain and preserve the *essential means* that are to effect the above purposes, in order to fulfil the decrees of our ALMIGHTY CREATOR: and that means is LIFE. As no one, I think, can deny their obligation to be careful of life, for the above ends; and as all are early convinced of the fatality of the Small-pox, when received by natural infection, how dangerous, how destructive a contagion it is; the following queries may not, perhaps, be uninteresting, and unworthy attention,

AND first, Do we act *prudently* and *wisely* by living in continual danger of being cut off by a most horrible distemper, when there are safe and certain means to avoid it?

Do we, by this gross obstinacy and neglect, set a proper value on the life that God has given us?



Do we, by thus despising the means of safety, endeavour to preserve life, agreeable to our duty, to answer the ends of the creation?

IF parents, do we act with tenderness, or justice to our children, by this conduct? or with affection towards them, if we neglect to secure *their* lives?

IF patriots, ministers, or any other useful members of the community, do we approve ourselves good subjects and discharge our duties to the nation and to society, if we risk the loss of our lives, and consequently the loss of our services to our fellow-creatures, by neglecting to embrace Inoculation?

So far from pleading *conscience* against Inoculation, can we say we are strictly satisfied *in our consciences* that we act well-pleasing unto God, by neglecting to use those salutary means for the preservation of life, which have been long practiced *with his blessing*?

OR can we peremptorily say, we are convinced *in our consciences* we should not be at all accessory to our death, (knowing the extreme safety of Inoculation) if we were cut off by the natural Small-pox?

MAY it not with the utmost reason, be presumed, as the ALMIGHTY has for many years given so extraordinary a blessing to Inoculation, that the act is pleasing in his sight? and does not his approbation of the

act imply an obligation on us to perform and embrace it?

In fine, can our present antagonists, who pretend to be so extremely tender and scrupulous in regard to conscience, answer the above questions, without entertaining the least doubt that the practice of Inoculation is just and lawful?

SURELY the act is not so manifest a sin, as to dispel every doubt to the contrary. If it was, there would be no dispute; all would be satisfied concerning it. Let then the enemies to Inoculation acknowledge, as we will charitably suppose is the case, that their scruples of conscience are no more than doubts concerning the lawfulness of the action; arising from a view of it in a wrong light, or owing to their not having studiously and strictly examined the subject, and propriety of their objections. The question then is, how are they best to act in their doubtful situation? the answer is obvious, viz. *in every doubtful case a man is to act as reasonably as he can.* It was observed in a former part of this discourse, that what was neither commanded or forbidden by the law of God, became an *indifferent thing*, and left to the option of man to do or omit; no sin being incurred in either respect. Allowing therefore Inoculation to be ranked under *things indifferent*, the propriety or impropriety of the

action (sin being out of the case) arises from the *fitness, expediency, or reasonableness* of it. If so, Inoculation is quickly restored (if I may use the expression) from a matter of *doubt*; the *fitness, expediency, and reasonableness* of it all conspiring to *persuade, to enforce, to justify* the practice. In short, the act of Inoculation cannot be opposed from any *scruples of conscience*, because all such scruples must be founded on the *law of God*; but as this cannot be pretended to in the present case, the act becomes a mere matter of doubt; to incline which, not *religion*, but *reason* is concerned: and if any can yet be in suspense which way *reason* will incline them to resolve their doubts, let them frequent the dwellings of the *inoculated*, and of those under natural infection, and they will have proofs fraught with conviction.

MANY are the variations of the *duty or obligation* we are all under to preserve life; and the modes in which it may be represented; but I flatter myself, the preceding questions are sufficient to shew that the *practice of Inoculation* can be defended and justified by other arguments than those of scripture.

ONE of the above queries intimates that the ALMIGHTY vouchsafes a blessing on the practice of Inoculation; from which may be drawn a strong, and I think, a conclusive argument in defence of it. 'Tis



true, indeed, we read in scripture that wicked people and their practices were crowned with success ; a blessing given to a sin, to bring about a wise and good end. But this affects not in the least our present subject. For in the first place we deny the action to be sinful, because it is not forbidden ; and because our motive or intention is certainly laudable and good ; being an endeavour to *preserve life*, (as ought to be supposed) to the glory of God and for the benefit of ourselves, families, and fellow-creatures. But allowing the action to be sinful, I demand an answer from the conscientious to the following question :

IF Inoculation be a sin, what good end can reason presume to suppose that God intends to bring about by giving a blessing and success to it ?

It will be an unfair answer to say that God's *ways are in the deep, and his paths past finding out* ; because in the particular cases mentioned in scripture, whose ends were accomplished by bad men and bad actions, it was *reasonable* to suppose, and easy to foresee that such would be the ends and consequences of the means so used. In short, they were very particular cases to answer temporary or immediate purposes. But Inoculation is a thing of general moment. The whole world is, or may be concerned in it. It is a practice now of some years standing. It is

reasonable therefore to suppose, if the ALMIGHTY was displeased with the action, he would have long ago shewn marks of his displeasure. As the action is not forbidden, and cannot, consequently, be proved sinful, will any be so hardy as to assert it is a sin; and that God has given thus long a blessing to it; such great and extensive success to a wickedness? --- Let us much rather believe that God, seeing the fatal distemper increasing, and spreading itself over the earth, sweeping away myriads of his creatures, instilled light into man's mind for the discovery of Inoculation, and will ever crown it with success. --- Another observation may be made to shew, that the present case is not similar to those in Scripture, and ought not to be judged parallel with them. It is this: --- the *ends* that were brought about by the above-mentioned means were local, confined to a particular people; but the blessing that God gives to Inoculation is extended to every tribe, to every nation, where practised.

I come now to take some little notice of the latter part of the foregoing general objection; for I hope I have in some measure proved *that reason does not*, in this particular, direct a choice of means contrary to the law of God; and that the act of Inoculation, so far as revelation is concerned, cannot be dis-



pleasing to the ALMIGHTY. The remaining reasons for retaining scruples of conscience against Inoculation, are much easier answered, and are as follow :

THE ALMIGHTY is LORD of life and death, and of all things to them pertaining, as health, strength, weakness and sickness. That to take the reins of these out of his hands must be wicked; and that moreover Inoculation is a sin, because it shews a mistrust of the ALMIGHTY, as if he was unable to deliver us from death.

THE arguments (if they deserve the name) that can be brought from hence, are of that kind which prove too much. --- As to the particular of taking the reins out of God's hands, I cannot better expose the absurdity of it, than by the following comparison. --- Man for his disobedience, was driven out of Paradise, to till and cultivate the ground from whence he was taken. Many of the sons of ADAM have their habitations near those bounds, beyond which the LORD of the universe says, *the sea shall not pass*. Man, by labour and experience finds, that the drops of the ocean, properly applied, enrich the land which he is commanded to cultivate; and accordingly unbars the bound of the sea that the waters may cover the face of the ground. --- Will any one say, that man takes the reins out of God's hand, because he makes



the sea pass those bounds which God says *it shall not pass*? The absurdity is too manifest to dwell on; for the will of God is not to obstruct the *good* of mankind.

MORE ridiculous, if possible, is the other observation, that *Inoculation implies a mistrust of the ALMIGHTY; as if he was unable to deliver us from death.* --- If this was the case, it would be a sin to apply to a physician or surgeon, or to take medicine to relieve us from pain or sickness, be the remedy at hand, and necessity ever so great and urgent. The truth is, there is one regular and established rule of government, or PROVIDENCE over us. We are subject to manifold diseases, that threaten our dissolution; but there are remedies to relieve us. 'Tis our duty to make use of them: without an endeavour on our part we cannot expect the grace or blessing of God in any thing. --- The ALMIGHTY works no miracles to save our lives. --- We may assure ourselves, therefore, it is our duty to partake of, and madness to refuse those blessings which man, under PROVIDENCE, has obtained for us, by indefatigable labour and study. That it behoves us, by every honest means to secure our lives here, as well as our salvation hereafter. In a word, we may embrace Inoculation with a safe conscience for the following

indisputable reasons. *The act is not forbidden by the law of God; the intention in us is good and laudable; and the means, if not abused, are inoffensive to our fellow-creatures.*

THERE remains a scruple of conscience still to be answered, in regard to the extent of Inoculation. For many approve of and embrace the act themselves, who cannot be persuaded to extend it to their infants, thinking it sinful to inoculate them without their consent, before they come to years of discretion, to chuse for themselves. But this scruple of conscience is equally weak and absurd with the foregoing: nay more so; --- for if we have satisfied ourselves that the action is *right* and *good* in itself, it is inconsistent in the nature of things to suppose that any sin can arise from the difference of age or subject on whom Inoculation is practised. But in fact, it is no matter of religious consideration, but an affair in which our prudence is solely concerned, and of which reason and experience shew the fitness and expediency. --- But, say the conscientious, *if our children die from Inoculation, we should never be easy in mind, nor forgive ourselves.* In the first place we answer, there is scarce a possibility of death attending the action; so safe is the practice, and so great is the perfection to which it is now brought. But allowing



that some infants may die, no sin is incurred, because the act is not forbidden, and our *intention*, agreeable to our former argument and the language of Scripture, *is to do good, to save life, not to destroy it*. But the best reply to make to all scrupulous parents is to ask them the following question:

If you neglect to have your children inoculated, and they are infected, as they grow up, with the natural Small-pox and die, have you not *real cause* to be uneasy, and to accuse yourselves of carelessness and want of natural affection, as the means to have saved their lives, at least from this kind of death, were so manifestly efficacious, and so indisputably safe? --- The chance that children are naturally infected with this distemper, before they come to years of discretion, amounts to a *great probability*; and that they may die under it, there is too much reason to fear; --- but that Inoculation will secure them from all danger, is not to be doubted, much less questioned.

I now flatter myself that what has been advanced, is sufficient to remove the scruples of the conscientious concerning the act of Inoculation. I shall therefore hasten to conclude, by shewing what great benefits result to ourselves and society from the practice of it.

THESE, indeed, are various and numerous, which



must naturally occur to every one who considers the subject with attention.--- Whether we view Inoculation in a public or private light, great are its benefits.--- In families how is their happiness established by this security of lives! To let this reflection have its due weight, we need only consider into what distresses many are plunged, by the sudden loss of parents, relations or friends, cut off by the malignancy of the natural Small-pox! And what sorrow, what grief of heart do parents frequently feel, by having their children, perhaps an only child, thus untimely caught away!---And moreover, what shocking objects thousands are in appearance, to the great unhappiness of their friends, who might have preserved the fair image of God, and escaped the severity and ravages of the dreadful ill!--- But how, I say, is domestic happiness, peace, and joy secured and continued by Inoculation! With what ecstasy does the affectionate wife receive her husband after he has thus surmounted a sickness, which she feared was *unto death*! With what transports does the tender husband meet his endearing partner, when she has thus lightly, and with, perhaps, additional beauty, secured her life!--- And with what inexpressible joy and pleasure do parents behold their children, their anxious hopes and fears, thus preserved from a fatal

distemper, and likely *to call*, for many years, *their lands after their own name*.

IF we consider this subject minutely, what benefits do we find arise from Inoculation, in regard to the affairs of life! --- Thousands there are who neglect many weighty concerns, and let slip lucky opportunities, for fear of being infected while from home, or at those places where their business and interest call them. Not to mention their continual dreadful apprehensions, which alone are sufficient to render their lives miserable!

NEXT, what inestimable advantages do the public reap from Inoculation! 'Tis most certainly a happy discovery, a blessing of the most weighty concern to this kingdom; whose strength, happiness, and security consist principally in the number of its inhabitants. --- The promoting the Practice of Inoculation is, therefore, consistent with our best policy, and should be encouraged, as much as possible, by the government: and more especially at this time, when the nation is so thin of men, that it is well known, and severely felt, thousands are wanted among the lower class, to perform the common works of husbandry and labour. But how would this scarcity of people be felt, if we were to be engaged soon again in another war! In short, every kingdom is the more



powerful the more it increases in population. If then every child's life is of great value to community, of how much more consequence are the lives of lusty youths and robust men! All, all are saved by Inoculation; but thousands, thro' neglect of it, are every year cut off in the prime of youth and manhood. Let any man seriously reflect what an immense loss, in many respects, this must naturally be to the nation. To treat this subject *politically* is not the business of the pulpit, otherwise many are the reasons that occur to persuade, to enforce the Practice of Inoculation, from the necessity of the times, the nature of the disorder, and constitutions of the people. Many are the arguments and persuasions to this end. All therefore, especially those in superior stations, should encourage and recommend so beneficial, so happy a means of self-preservation; and endeavour by every argument to remove the scruples of the *weak*, that the blessing may *extend* to every part of the kingdom, and to every individual.

To conclude. That there should be people who oppose the practice and progress of Inoculation, I mean from mere prejudice, for we have done with the scrupulous and conscientious, is hard to reconcile. The danger on one hand is manifestly great, the extreme safety on the other is experimentally proved,



and universally known. Thousands are cut off by the one, and tens of thousands saved by the other. There, death triumphantly walks the streets, seeking whom he may devour; here, he is banished from our habitations, and deprived of all power to approach and hurt us. There, we continually hear the solemn knell; here, the loud peals of joy and health. --- Let us not then be so mad as to oppose REASON; so foolish as to disregard EXPERIENCE; and so obstinate as to stand out against CONVICTION. In a word, let us not meanly and cowardly submit to death when we have disarmed him of his sting, and obtained *this* victory over the grave. --- But let us, while we admire the successful practice of man, ultimately attribute this great blessing to the goodness of that Being, whose mercy is over all his works, and ever practice it in its utmost extent, to his glory and the good of mankind.

Now to God, &c.

## PRAYERS used at Mr. SUTTON'S.

---

### *A PRAYER for the Recovery of Patients under Inoculation.*

*[To be used after O God the Creator, &c.]*

**O** ALMIGHTY GOD, in whom we live, move, and have our being, and to whom alone belong the issues of life and death, our only help in time of need, most humbly we beseech thee to grant, that all those of this present household, who now labour under an indisposition of body, may safely and speedily recover from their infirmity. And most earnestly we implore thy greatest blessing on this and every endeavour of men, to preserve the lives of their fellow-creatures, that our days may be prolonged upon earth, to thy honour and glory, through JESUS CHRIST our LORD. *Amen.*

---

### *A PRAYER for the Recovery of Patients from Inoculation.*

*[To be used after the General Thanksgiving.]*

**O** ALMIGHTY and most merciful Father, by whose gracious providence our lives are prolonged, and we are preserved from the manifold dangers that beset us, we return thee our unfeigned sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for blessing those means to us, which therefore we presume to use, and in confidence of thy divine pleasure, continue to pursue, for subduing the power of that sickness which hath been so often unto death. And vouchsafe, we beseech thee, particularly to accept the grateful thanks of all those in this present congregation, to whom thou hast lately restored the voice of joy and health. For this thy preservation and providence over us, we laud and magnify thy glorious name, and ascribe all honour and power to Thee, the Son, and Holy Ghost, now and for ever. *Amen.*



# A P P E N D I X

ON THE

Present State of INOCULATION,

WITH

OBSERVATIONS, &c.





APPENDIX

OF THE

APPENDIX

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

## APPENDIX, &amp;c.

THE progress of Inoculation, like that of many other arts, has been in general extremely slow; owing to the ignorance and barbarism of the people by whom it was discovered, and to the sluggish genius and prejudice of the countries, where it has been introduced and attempted to be cultivated. Nay the French, who esteem themselves the most *enlightened*, and *sensible* nation under heaven, willing to give an evident proof of their *sagacity* and *wisdom*, have forbid, in general, by order of parliament, the Practice of Inoculation. But we poor ignorant *John Trots*, who must not pretend to dispute their superior sense, have given a kind reception to the banished art, are grateful for the blessing, and shall *humbly* endeavour, by means of it, to preserve

the lives of many English *bearts of oak*, who may, one time or other, drub the *Mon-sieurs* for their folly. But to be serious.

NOTWITHSTANDING the art of Inoculation, since it was first discovered, has been in general slow in its progress, and very gradually, and in many respects very injudiciously practised, it has rapidly advanced, within these last ten years, towards the point and summit of perfection; and, like MILTON's divine poem, has broke from the shackles of ignorance and prejudice, and is esteemed by every rational man, an art, a blessing of the most inestimable value.—The merit of this perfection, I readily attribute, without the least apprehension of being contradicted, to the skill, the indefatigable labours and experiments of the Sutton family, who now practice Inoculation with unparalleled and astonishing success, in different parts of the kingdom. Particularly is the public indebted to Mr. Da-



*niel Sutton*, the Gentleman to whom the foregoing Discourse is addressed; — whose singular method of Inoculation, and the many great improvements, and lights he has made and thrown on the Practice, have excited the attention, surprize and admiration of the whole kingdom, especially of the faculty. — That the reader may form some opinion of the skill of this Gentleman, of the safety of his practice, and power of his medicines, I present them with the following particulars; knowing them to be facts, as I have long been conversant with his method, frequented his houses, and an eye-witness to all I assert.

AND first, the slightness of his operation in communicating the infection, may well demand our admiration. It is easier than we can possibly conceive. With respect to pain, it is not equal to the thousandth part which the prick of a pin gives. The operation is performed on most without their

feeling or knowing it: and in a minute afterwards, the puncture is scarce visible. I mention this, because many are apt to dread the operation, being apprehensive that a large incision is to be made.—The whole that follows, is perfectly in character with the operation. The patients in general have little or no sickness: their indisposition is so trifling that they are ashamed to complain; and in a few days they are perfectly well. Here is no confinement, no keeping of bed. All is mirth, and all seem happy. In fact, this fortnight-visit to Mr. Sutton's, abounds with real pleasure and satisfaction. The pleasing conversation of the company, added to their various amusements, makes the time glide away imperceptibly. ——— If Mr. Sutton perceives a symptom in patients of a great fever, or a probability of their having more pustules than they would chuse, he quickly prevents both by virtue of his medicines. In short, if any patient in the

house has twenty or thirty pustules, he is said to have the Small-pox very heavy. — 'Tis impossible to make the reader conceive, with what ease, with what trifling sickness and extreme safety this Gentleman, his family, and assistants, conduct patients through Inoculation. If there were not thousands that can attest it, I should be backward to risk being believed by the public, though I have the strongest demonstration of it myself.

I HAVE heard it said by several eminent physicians, that if any medicine can be discovered to prevent a too great burthen of pustules, that such medicine would be inestimable. There is no doubt but this secret lies in the breast of the SUTTON family. 'Tis seldom they have occasion much to use it; but its efficacy and power have been often tried and proved; and that very lately on a lady's child who is almost my next door neighbour. The child was seized with the natural Small-pox unknown to the pa-



rent. As soon as it was discovered by the pustules making a plentiful appearance, the child was conveyed to one of Mr. SUTTON'S houses. The next morning the face and body being extremely full, Mr. SUTTON marked with a pen a great number of pustules, and administered the medicine I allude to: some hours afterwards, hundreds of the pustules disappeared; and among them several of those marked, leaving the little dot on the plain surface of the skin. The child did extremely well. For the satisfaction of the curious, I take the liberty to mention that the child was son to Mr. BARNARD, of WITHAM in ESSEX, who died of the natural confluent Small-pox, and from whom the child is supposed to have caught the infection. Mrs. BARNARD, the mother, attended her child all the time he was at Mr. Sutton's.—However surprizing this may seem, it is an experiment that has been often tried and proved. And any who

appeal to Mr. Sutton may have many instances given where this medicine has been equally powerful and efficacious. It is also worthy of notice to observe, that two days before Mr. BARNARD's death, Mr. SUTTON took some matter from him to inoculate a gentleman's family near Ipswich, the gentleman desiring that his children might be inoculated with natural matter. Notwithstanding it is reasonable to suppose that this matter was of the most virulent kind, Mr. SUTTON, by his medicine, prevented any ill effects arising from it; and the children had but six or eight pustules, and those of the finest and most distinct sort. —What a happiness, what a great satisfaction must it be then, to a patient to reflect, that if he should be in any danger of having a burthen of pustules, there is a means to prevent it! By his singular method of Inoculation not one in a thousand have more pustules than they wish; but I must repeat that

it is an unspeakable satisfaction to consider he has a powerful medicine to dispel every symptom of danger. — There are many other surprising and singular circumstances in Mr. Sutton's practice which I cannot mention consistently with friendship, and my promise of secrecy. — I shall conclude therefore these observations, by giving the number of patients he has inoculated in these last three years; which account I have taken from his books, and is as follows;

In the year 1764—1629

1765—4347

1766—7816

---

13792

---

In the last two years Mr. Sutton inoculated several large parties at a time; particularly, four hundred and seventeen people on one day at Maldon in Essex. Besides several hundreds in and near Maidstone



in Kent, and many of the first families in the county. — To the above number should be added six thousand that have been inoculated by Mr. Sutton's assistants, as he taught them his method, and as they use none but his medicines. So that he may be said to have inoculated within these three years, twenty thousand persons. take no notice here of the numbers inoculated by him, during the several years he was in practice with his father, because he kept no regular account of them.

Of the above multitude he denies that a single patient has died *fairly* from INOCULATION, (by him or his assistants) or from its effects. The death of two or three reported to have died was owing, one to his own imprudence in being drunk several times during the eruption; the other two to complicated disorders, which would have killed them had they not been inoculated: for as to the Small-pox, they had but very

few pustules, and had taken their leave of Mr. Sutton. — But here it ought to be remarked, that had he absolutely lost fifty out of the above number, no argument could be drawn from thence to depreciate his method and medicines. Let any unprejudiced and reasonable man reflect what an immense number five thousand only is to inoculate; of what various constitutions they must naturally be; and what latent weaknesses and infirmities many must have among them. Let us consider what great odds it is, supposing we chuse some thousands of the most *healthy* people we know, that several of them die within a fortnight; the time that patients in general are under Mr. Sutton's care. — But was it not a miracle almost, with respect to the town of Maldon in Essex, where Mr. Sutton inoculated above four hundred one morning, that not one patient should die, considering they were of all ages and

constitutions; every person in the town being inoculated that had not had the Small-pox! Several other large parties in Kent, and in various parts of the kingdom have been inoculated in the same manner, and with the same success.

In a word, any man that will undertake to enquire into Mr. SUTTON's success, may have the most convincing proofs from many of the first families in the kingdom, as well as from thousand others, that his method of Inoculation is most easy and safe, and that his medicines are most efficacious and powerful.—Many instances could be mentioned of his skill in the natural Small-pox. That of a young lady at MAIDSTONE, whom he saved last autumn, after she was given over by her physician, is well known, and is alone sufficient to establish his character for ever.

SUCH a long unfulfilled success, has greatly excited the attention of the king-



dom, particularly of the faculty; some of whom have made diligent enquiries into the truth of it, and endeavoured by many artful, if not *mean* methods, to discover the SECRETS of the SUTTONIAN PRACTICE. Others have wrote pamphlets containing common and trifling informations that they have received from some of Mr. SUTTON's patients; *displaying* his method of preparation, which they might have copied from any of his printed bills of directions.—These learned and *satisfactory* pamphlets contain also shrewd and *probable conjectures* of the ingredients that compose his medicines. But I think it is probable that few readers will be weak enough to swallow a *conjecture* that may turn out a disagreeable *certainty*; or at least make use of it, when they know where to apply for the real secret.

Two pamphlets have lately appeared on this subject, written by two eminent Phy-

ficians ; one by Dr. BAKER, F. R. S. and Physician to her Majesty's household ; the other, being a Letter in answer to Dr. BAKER, by Dr. GLASS of Exeter. The substance of these pieces relates to the practice of a *certain person and his sons*, as these authors stile the *Sutton* family. But I am at a loss to guess why they forbore to mention the name of *Sutton*. Surely, if their practice is worthy the notice of these eminent physicians, this little honour might have been paid. But perhaps Dr. BAKER and Dr. GLASS thought, that by mentioning the name of the operators, whose practice they deigned to write on, they might influence the public too much in their favour. — I wish I had as great an opinion of Dr. BAKER's ingenuousness as I have of his ingenuity. But I hardly think it fair, that he should employ means to obtain informations from the patients of a gentleman, relative to his practice, which is his



livelihood, and then discover them to the world. But he has gone farther; for since his late publication, he has applied to the worthy and sensible clergyman, he speaks of in his pamphlet, and who favoured him with much of his information, to endeavour to get from Mr. *Robert Sutton*, (one of the sons, who like the rest of the family practices with the greatest success) answers to the following queries.

WHETHER the pill or powder after Inoculation be the same with the preparatory powder?

Do you ever trust to sweating medicines in the eruptive fever?

Does the pill or powder ever vomit?

Is the punch a sudorific or a cooler?

Do you inoculate with any moisture taken from the arm within four days after the operation?

THERE were more queries; but, my dear Dr. BAKER, how could you imagine that



Mr. *Sutton* would answer such home questions? Can you think that he would do justice to himself and family by thus discovering several *essentials* of his practice, especially too to a gentleman, who just before published to the world all the information he could get relative to his method? Indeed, my good doctor, the *Sutton* family have as much *sensibility* in the touch of *omnium gatherum* as yourself. — In short, Dr. BAKER has discovered to the public what was never made a secret of, viz. that part of Mr. *Sutton's* practice consists in adhering to a *cool regimen*.

A FEW weeks since Dr. GLASS, an eminent physician at Exeter, published a letter to Dr. BAKER, by way of answer to his pamphlet; questioning the general propriety of the cool regimen, notwithstanding the *Sutton* family have practiced it with success, in above forty thousand instances. — The reader will please to observe, that Dr. GLASS

tells us, "he has followed his own principles and notions, and that these have led him to conclusions, which, in some instances, oppose the opinion of Dr. BAKER." No doubt of it. I never knew a man that would tamely give up his *notions* and *principles*, if there was the least room for contradiction; and the faculty are the last gentlemen in the world that regard each other's opinion or prescription. — Dr. GLASS therefore, who has certainly some little veneration for old nurses, has advanced in his letter, by way of contradiction, that there are some cases in which the *cool regimen* would be dangerous; and when nursing and comfortable cordials are absolutely necessary. By the bye, Dr. BAKER had said nothing to the contrary; but argued in general that experience enforced the use of the cool regimen. Dr. GLASS, however, had an itch for writing, and he knew a pamphlet must be about something; and therefore raised an



objection of his own, learnedly disputed the point, and answered it most fully, viz. *by his own method of practice.* Dr. GLASS has made, in his letter, a very clear, and a very abstruse discovery. The former is, "*that acids stain pewter pots black.*" — the latter, or very abstruse discovery is, "*It is a contradiction, that a determined effect should exist in virtue of a cause, which doth not contain the entire and complete reason of its existence.*"

BEFORE I take my leave of these Gentlemen, I must be so free as to inform them that their late publications contain little, very little indeed of the Suttonian Practice of Inoculation. — For their treatment of their patients, particularly in respect to giving the medicines, depends entirely on their constitutions, and the nature of the case. As these must be various, and in many respects extremely different, it certainly requires much skill and experience to know



and manage them. Nothing, therefore, of great consequence, can be ascertained from the informations even of many patients, as they can give no reason why they were treated in this or that manner. Besides it will be paying Mr. *Sutton* a very ill compliment to suppose, that he has but one general method; and that he administers his medicines indiscriminately to all. — The time will come, perhaps, when the *Sutton* family will generously disclose to the world their justly singular, noble, and inestimable Practice of Inoculation. But before this, little is to be expected from any attempts that may be made to discover it or their medicines, and less to be depended on from wild and superficial conjecture.

WHILE the candid and unprejudiced were struck with silent admiration at the uncommon and rapid success of this family, there have not been wanting men from time to time, who, being instigated

by envy, malice, and all the viler passions, have racked their brains for means, however base and unjustifiable, to obstruct, to ridicule, to depreciate and villify the Suttonian Practice. As this opposition has been chiefly levelled at Mr. *Daniel Sutton*, the Gentleman who is the principal subject of this publication, I shall confine the remainder of the Appendix to him.—— At the latter end of the year 1763, Mr. *Sutton* came into Essex, and settled in his present habitation, near the town of Ingatestone, under the great disadvantage of being unknown to any in the neighbourhood. Success and merit had scarce owned him for their child, when the sluices of envy, calumny and unprovoked malice were opened against him. Notwithstanding he had long practised Inoculation under his father, he was represented as the lowest of mankind; one that had just jumped into the profession, without sense, art, or a single degree of



merit. How much he deserved this character, time has evinced; and I hope long shewn his first enemies the true complexion, the real *blackness* of their hearts.—The limits of this work will not admit of my mentioning a thousandth part of the scandalous means that have been used to obstruct him in the course of his practice. I shall therefore only remark two oppositions, they being the *best* contrived and the most likely to have hurt him; the *justness* of which the reader must determine.

ABOUT the beginning of last summer the Small-pox broke out in a most violent manner at Chelmsford in Essex, sweeping off every week many of the inhabitants. This was a fine opportunity for Mr. *Sutton's* enemies (many of whom live in that quarter) to surmise, invent and propagate what calumnies they pleased; especially as he sometimes came on market-days to treat with people, who were inclined to be ino-



culated. If any person chanced to accompany him in his carriage, it was always industriously reported, that such person was a patient brought to inoculate from. Others could see small pocks out in full bloom (as they expressed it) notwithstanding the companion was frequently an acquaintance;— and as it is diametrically contrary to Mr. *Sutton's* practice to inoculate from such kind of patients. But we shall prove presently, by the greatest evidence, that such were no more nor less than *gross lies*. Mr. *Sutton*, however, was declared to be the man that infected Chelmsford with the Small-pox, notwithstanding *every Apothecary in the town was an Inoculator*, and had long practised round the neighbourhood: nay some of them had absolutely inoculated persons of the town at their own houses, and this before the Small-pox raged with any violence\*. Mr. *Sutton* too must be the man, not-

---

\* The author does not mean to insinuate, that the Gentlemen Apothecaries of Chelmsford acted wrong. 'Tis madness that the whole town is not inoculated; as from its situation, it will be always subject to the Small-pox.

withstanding Chelmsford lies in the great road from London to Colchester, Ipswich, Norwich, Harwich, &c. where many stage-coaches stop, and which it is reasonable to suppose, frequently bring passengers just come from infected houses, and many doubtless that are just recovered from the Small-pox, with their infectious bundles of linen, &c.

——Scandalous accusation! base partiality!

In short, the unjust insinuation was industriously and artfully kept up, and influenced a general belief. On this, a set of men, whose *justice, honour and integrity* I want words to express, waited on a distinguished personage to head their *benevolent* design. This Gentleman who has, in fact, an heart ever ready to do good, a heart that is naturally an enemy to oppression, was borne down with repeated asseverations, and forced as it were by the cries of the people, to appear in a prosecution, which, had not calumny and prejudice strongly barricaded the voice of truth from his ears, he would never



have countenanced. — In consequence of these groundless insinuations and misrepresentations, an inditement was preferred last summer assize at Chelmsford, against Mr. *Daniel Sutton*, Surgeon, for a nuisance; when the Grand Jury not only not found the bill against him, but observed publicly in Court to Lord MANSFIELD, “*that not one single article alledged against him in the inditement was proved; and that moreover they thought it partial to prosecute Mr. Sutton in particular, since they did not find but that the Apothecaries of the town inoculated likewise.*” They observed however, that Mr. *Sutton* had been somewhat indiscreet, and of which indiscretion they would admonish him. But I take the liberty to say, that had the Grand Jury known the nature of Mr. *Sutton*’s practice, they would not have censured him for indiscretion. For had the inditement been found, he would have assuredly nonsuited his enemies, and have proved beyond a possibility of doubt, that he never brought into



Chelmsford a patient, who was capable of infecting a bye-stander, notwithstanding such person would convey infection by inoculation. However paradoxical this may seem, it is truth, and would have been proved to a demonstration. But the Grand Jury justly saved Mr. *Sutton* from being obliged in his defence to discover one of the most essential parts and secrets of his profession.— Such was the cause and issue of the Chelmsford inditement. A prosecution founded on sinister and malicious prejudice, supported by lying clamour, carried on with vindictive rage, but opposed by TRUTH, and frustrated by JUSTICE. — Such, O *Sutton*, will certainly be the fate of all the envious and malicious projects of thy opposers:— such the shame of all thy enemies. I shall now conclude with the following letter to Mr. ROBERT PINE, Surgeon, at Maidstone in Kent, who has opposed Mr. *Sutton*, by a method that exceeds the *justice* of the Chelmsford Inditement.

## To Mr. PINE.

S I R,

**T**HERE is not a wretch on earth whom I more heartily pity than yourself. For a man who is preyed on by those vultures envy, malice and revenge, must be a wretch indeed: and though he justly deserves the greatest infamy and contempt for yielding to the instigations of these viler passions, he is still a real object of distress, and truly worthy to be commiserated. That you, Sir, are this poor miserable wretch, the offspring of Envy, the child of Malice and slave to Revenge, you have given the public too much reason to believe. — 'Tis doubtless most mortifying to reflect, that a young proficient, a stranger to your county, should invade your field of practice, should rob you of your *birth-right*, as you vainly imagine; and in a short time eclipse your fame and glory. But reason, nay, common sense should have taught you to be so wise and prudent as to have endeavoured to cultivate an acquaintance, not to have waged war with merit and success. — But I must drop, Sir, all formal harangue with you. Your illiberal attack of me some time ago, in the St. James's Chronicle, and your unprecedented treatment of my friend Mr. SUTTON, demand that I lash your conduct with that freedom and severity it deserves.

You have no right to an apology for my thus exposing you, nor reason to expect the least favour, because you first insulted me without cause, and endeavoured to wound my character from a *bare suspicion* or *villainous* information that I was your enemy. For I deny to have had any concern in the affair of Mr. FORSTER's letter; and am desirous to open your eyes and to acquaint you, that the advertisement which contained his letter, was published to weaken the Chelmsford Inditement then depending; and the insertion of *seven thousand* was used as an innocent means to influence an unjust prosecution. It had its effect; and I envy the person that thought of it. This was the *end* it was intended to *answer*; but you, stung with suspicion, and alarmed for your practice, concluded it



must be levelled against you, and that I, from my connection with Mr. SUTTON, must certainly be the man; and therefore you had the effrontery to mean me (for I have repeatedly traced it to you) in your observation, that "*there is one person, go where he will,*" &c.—In short, if Mr. FORSTER did not insert the number *seven* thousand, time has almost evinced that he ought to have done it; and as to the epithet *great* before majority, I think Mr. FORSTER cannot so strictly charge his memory as to be certain that he did not insert it. Be this as it may, as I have heard it declared for fact, that there was a *great* majority in favour of Mr. SUTTON, your asserting to the contrary in the St. James's Chronicle, will have very little weight with me. But why do I waste time to justify the insertion of a word, when the whole county of Kent rings with the name of SUTTON, and contains not only a *great* but an *infinite* majority for him. — But to the purpose.

You had no sooner the extreme mortification to hear that a majority of your own town had invited Mr. SUTTON, (known only in Kent by fame) to come and inoculate, but you hastened to the temple of Calumny, to impley means to depreciate his character, and villify his success. The haggard fiend heard your prayer, and dispatched not a lying dream, but a real imp of Falsehood, (from Maldon in Essex) whom you received with a ghastly smile, listened with malicious pleasure to his infernal tale and propagated it with revengeful and remorseless haste.— I proved to you, by letter, that you had imposed on the public a base insinuation, and was in hopes, that from that time you would have forbore to oppose merit, knowing that I was master of a secret, the discovery of which would be of material consequence to your Character. But as I have since found that your inveterate envy has banished all sense of shame, and that you endeavour more and more to aggravate your offence, I shall disclose what, I doubt not, will startle many of your friends.— You, sir, to fully Mr. SUTTON's success, had the assurance to distribute thousands of hand-bills over the county of Kent, signed with your name, of which I saw numbers posted up at Rochester, Maidstone, &c. to insinuate that two children, in or near Maldon, viz. *Carter and Poole*, died under Mr. SUTTON's



Inoculation.—But to your infamy and disgrace, an eminent surgeon at Maldon asserts, “That he attended both these children; that neither of them died from Inoculation, or from the effects of it, but from quite different causes.”—This gentleman’s name I mentioned to you in my letter; to give you an opportunity of discovering your shame, by your own enquiry. But you, sir, if the world says true, should be the last man, from your own ill-success, to mention that of any other, however unfortunate he has been in his practice.

I now take my leave of you, by remarking a glaring instance of Ingratitude. Before Mr. SUTTON came into Kent, you used to prepare your patients a much longer time than you do at present, or at least than you did when he was at Maidstone. And that the Public might know this alteration in your method, you surprized them with the following very singular and *masterly* stroke; “Mr. Pine finds *by experience*, that a fortnight’s preparation is *sufficient*. I am not certain, as I have not your advertisement, whether the time was not less. But pray, sir, uncover you breast, and answer me, honestly, this question; did you not acquire this experimental knowledge from Mr. SUTTON’s practice? If so, have you not acted towards him with the blackest ingratitude?

I am, Sir,

With a *proper* Respect,

Your’s,

ROBERT HOULTON.

N. B. From the nature of this publication I expect much abuse; but I shall take no notice of any Impertinence, unless signed with the writer’s *real* name.

F I N I S.

In a few Months will be published,  
Dedicated to Sir WILLIAM MILDMAI, Bart.  
A VOLUME OF  
**MISCELLANEOUS POETRY;**  
CONSISTING OF  
Poems, Pastorals, Odes, Epigrams, &c.

With a Version of the Rev. Mr. COTTON's three elegant Latin  
Elegies, entitled,

LACHRYMÆ ELEGIACÆ,

SIVE

QUERELÆ EPISTOLARES.

By ROBERT HOULTON, M. A.

Late of MAGDALEN-COLLEGE, OXFORD.

These Pieces will be comprised in a large Octavo Volume, printed in the most elegant Manner on Royal Paper; and as the Publication will be by Subscription, the Names of Subscribers will be printed; to whom the Price is Five Shillings, to be paid on the Delivery of the Book.

The Author is already honoured with many Names of the Nobility and principal Gentry; therefore he shall be greatly obliged to those who are inclined to favour this Publication, if they would subscribe as soon as convenient, as almost all the Pieces are ready for the Press.

SUBSCRIPTIONS are taken in by

R. DAVIS, Bookseller, in Piccadilly; J. WILKIE, in St. Paul's Church-yard; S. PARKER, at Oxford; Messrs. FLETCHER and HODSON, at Cambridge; B. COLLINS, at Salisbury; L. HASSALL, at Chelmsford; J. KEYMER, at Colchester; W. TAYLOR, at Bath, and W. CRUTTWELL, at Sherborne.





*Handwritten: K. 4. 11. 24. 4.*

*Handwritten: H. 4. 11. 24. 4.*

## To the CRITICAL REVIEWERS.

### MESSEURS CRITICS,

I Have read *something*, which, I suppose, you call a *Review* of, and *impartial* criticism on my late sermon in defence of Inoculation, &c. with a *just, conclusive, and full* refutation of the Preface.—'Tis natural, you'll say, for me to think otherwise; but as I like to give reasons for my sentiments, I beg that you will graciously condescend to peruse the following letter.—I once believed you were made up of philosophy; but I am now thoroughly convinced (according to the Shandean style) that you have as much gumminess in the linings of your jackets as other men, and that none will fret and chafe sooner than yours. It is manifest that my prefatory Letter has *spurred* you; and, perhaps, this may make you *wince*; but let me warn you not to *kick* and *splash dirt* in defence.—To the point then:

IMPRIMIS, you *learnedly and judiciously* write thus: "The design of this discourse is to vindicate the common practice of inoculating the small-pox against all objections of a religious nature."—Most wonderful discovery indeed, to find out a writer's design!—But pray, Messrs. Hypercritics, is it not the profession, office, and duty of Reviewers to inform the public whether such design is well or ill executed? Have they not a right, from the very nature of your undertaking, to expect this?—Therefore, if my arguments in defence of Inoculation are pertinent and con-



## A L E T T E R

vincing, you do me *injustice* by your silence. If, on the contrary, they are puerile, weak and inconclusive, you act very *unjustly* towards the public, by not intimating as much, in order to prevent their mispending both time and money.—Remark, then, that I first clearly convict you of *injustice*.

HAVING thus reviewed my whole discourse, which is pretty long, while one can say Jack *Robinson*, you skip to the Appendix, and observe, that “It is a kind of panegyric on Mr. SUTTON, a surgeon in the county of Essex, who within the last three years is said to have inoculated twenty thousand persons.” Yes, ye learned tribe, it is a kind of panegyric, and a very peculiar and uncommon *kind* too. It is a panegyric that Mr. SUTTON *absolutely deserves*: a panegyric, ’tis true, on a surgeon in Essex, but a surgeon that is known by fame in every county in the kingdom, and to nations far distant. But who, except yourselves, will ever write panegyrics on the Critical Reviewer? Or when will your fame reach the ears of any but those who are incapable of *judging for themselves*, and who consequently are not qualified to *discover the merit of your publication*. It is not only *said*, but it can be proved that Mr. SUTTON has inoculated the number advanced.—From this Appendix you give the following short extract, *as a specimen of my diction*: “Of the above multitude, says Mr. Houlton, he denies that a single patient has died fairly from Inoculation (by him or his assistants) or from its effects. The death of two or three, reported to have died, was owing, one to his own imprudence in being drunk several times during the eruption, the other two to complicated disorders, which would have killed them had they not been inoculated; for as to the Small-pox, they had but very few pustules, and had taken their leave of Mr. SUTTON.”—I will rea-



## TO THE CRITICAL REVIEWERS.

dily allow that this passage might have been better expressed ; the least attention only was necessary. But here I must arraign you of the most unfair and ungenerous treatment. The part of the Appendix, from whence this extract is made, relates to some few observations on Mr. SUTTON's practice, which I had liberty to mention ; and therefore I chose to do it in the most plain narrative style possible. For with respect to relations of practical facts and observations, what is generally understood by style, would be, in this case, as ridiculous and preposterous, as to use a simple narrative diction on a sublime subject.—No one, therefore, can form the least judgment of my style, or manner of writing from the above extract, no more than we can estimate a man's sense by his making a trifling observation concerning the weather.—But with the leave of your HIGH MIGHTINESSES, I will quote a passage from my letter or preface, the diction of which, I flatter myself, will be extremely *pleasing* to you, and which you *forgot* to take notice of in your Review. After mentioning a certain person's intimacy with one of your associates, I express myself thus: " For if little country booksellers have that influence with you, to get what remarks they please, made on publications, because, forsooth, they are not employed by the authors, who can longer esteem the Critical Reviewer "

Now, Gentlemen, as you are certainly guilty, in the eye of candour, of gross disingenuousness, in giving the above extract as a specimen of my diction, when, I must have the vanity to say, you knew there were many others far superior to it, can you blame me for turning the tables on you. Be this as it may, I will commence Critic and Reviewer, sit in judgment on your heads, and point out some *striking beauties* of your style and diction, contained in your last Review, viz. for March 1767. I will begin with your



## A L E T T E R

Monthly Catalogue, No. 9.—As most school-boys are generally flogged for a *false concord*, what punishment do the Critical Reviewers deserve for this fault, who esteem themselves the sole judges of a pure style and diction?—Alack! alack! I pity you, but out it must: “We can only speak from our own observation, that if there is any *incidents* drawn from the life, in the adventures of Mr. Atall, &c.”—Perhaps you have a *critica licentia* for this mode of writing.—I will next give a specimen of your elegant diction, a striking instance of a fine smooth-turn’d period. It is taken from your remark on No. 11.—“Miss Greville’s delicacy is carried to a very great height, in refusing to make Mr. Byron happy, merely because his interest might be injured by it, or that he might displease his Uncle, who did not, at that time, entertain the most favourable sentiments of the lady; and her earnestly counselling him to marry another woman, to promote the satisfaction of her rival’s family, and because she had a greater fortune than herself, is not, we think, considering the ardour of her passion, in nature.”—This long winded sentence could be most excellently spliced out into parentheses. Pardon me, Messrs. Reviewers, but absolutely the uncouthness of the whole passage, and the abrupt bluntness of the period, convey strongly to me the idea of a lame horse hobbling over rough stones, and at length running his head against a post.

THE conclusion of the next sentence is also most admirable and elegant. Speaking of Mr. Byron’s precipitate marriage on supposition that Miss Greville was attached to another, you add, “and the impropriety is farther heightened by his never after mentioning it to her. What fine language, and diction this! by his never after mentioning it to her; most elegant indeed. But the next sentence



## TO THE CRITICAL REVIEWER.

amply recompences for this *water-gruel* style; and, to use your own words, is an *inimitable piece of mellifluous nonsense*. "This production may find admirers among those who are fond of the *labyrinths of romantic love, displayed in pleasing language*:" Most sublime.—The following remark on No. 38, is "grievously incumbered (to use your own phraseology) with the repetition of the pronoun *it* and the verb substantive *was*, viz "*it is well known that it was by this Lady Inoculation was first introduced into England. Had you expressed yourselves thus, It is well known that Inoculation was first introduced by this Lady into England*, you would have avoided both the redundancies. Was it worth my while to read your Reviews, I doubt not but I should often meet with many inaccuracies of language, absurd expressions, and stupid observations: not that I believe such inaccuracies to be the effect of ignorance, but of negligence or non-attention. This confession, perhaps, shews me to be endowed with more ingenuousness than your whole tribe. Thus you see, ye *learned and impartial Critics*, that you have acted unfairly and most ungenerously in giving the above extract as a specimen of my diction, since it is evident, I flatter myself, that the exceptionable part was owing entirely to negligence; of which I have also clearly convicted you.

I confess I was mistaken with respect to the publisher, inserted in your review, of my discourse on Detraction. Nevertheless Toft's name was tacked to the other two pieces; so that I was right in general, which is more, perhaps, than you can boast of your criticisms. I should have taken no notice of this affair had you favoured me with a publisher or vender, who *lawfully* professed the business of printer or bookseller.

It is, doubtless, very easy to assert "a young divine is petulant;

## A LETTER

that people will laugh at his folly, and that it can be no advantage to any man *living* (as you express it) to have his name annexed to his publications."—But I am ashamed to see men, who stile themselves CRITICAL REVIEWERS, and would be esteemed judges of learning, wit and taste, use such weak, blunt, puerile weapons as *ipse dixit*.

Your remark that my prefatory letter is injudiciously placed at the head of a sermon. What a freight must critics be reduced to, when they can only find fault with the *place* where a letter is introduced. But this is like a school-boy's complaining that the rod is put in his sight. I am thoroughly convinced, that, in general, you don't review or rather peruse one tenth part of any publication; I concluded therefore, if I did not *place* my letter somewhere at the beginning, it would stand little chance of being read by your HIGH MIGHTINESSES. Will any *laugh at my folly for this*?

FINALLY, you observe that serious readers expect evangelical meekness, and that my publication is not a work of piety.—O ye wiseacres! do you think I am not sensible what drugs mere sermons are, and how ill they sell? Have not I published a sermon on Detraction, and, perhaps, experienced the truth of this? But you forget yourselves. Do you not observe in your remarks on No. 46, that "The generality of those writers who have published their meditations on subjects of religion, have met with no favourable reception from readers of taste; because their writings have had *nothing* but their *piety* to recommend them." I was much of your opinion, and therefore prefixed a letter to you, which I knew would please many, especially those who have not the honour of your good opinion, or rather who scorn to *bribe* for applause.—I shall take my final leave of you, by giving the strongest proof of your partiality.

A Book entitled, "The Power of Faith and Godliness exem-



## TO THE CRITICAL REVIEWERS.

plished in some memoirs of Theophilus Lobb, M. D. F. R. S." was lately published by John Green. This performance, which reflects no great honour on diploma-physicians and the Royal Society, you have taken notice of in your last Review; but whether *partially* or *impartially* is the question. — Let us first read the remarks of the MONTHLY REVIEWERS on this publication.

"From these memoirs we learn, that the late Dr. Lobb was born; that he suck'd in non-conformity with his mother's milk; that he was himself a dissenting minister (in Somersetshire and elsewhere) before he became a physician; that in the year 1713, when he was 35 years old, and eleven years after his commencing preacher, the doctor and the devil grew very intimate; 'that he was guilty of many aggravated iniquities, omissions of duty, and commissions of sin;' that this was not all—for 'Satan assaulted and followed him with horrid and violent temptations, to the commission of a monstrous crime, from which 'however, it pleased God to preserve him;' that in the same year he wrote his covenant with God, wherein he confesses himself, by his wicked practices, a son of death and a child of hell;—and acknowledges that he had wickedly sided with God's enemies; that, nevertheless, he grew very pious and good, and often renewed his covenant, renouncing 'Sin and Shame, and all the lusts of the flesh;' that notwithstanding the power of faith and godliness were thus manifested in this good man, something or other was still the matter, so that he and his congregation frequently disagreed, particularly about his sermons; that in 1722, he lost his 'godly and loving wife' and prayed to God to provide him another in her stead; that 'God graciously heard and answer'd his prayers,' and that the Dr. was very thankful; that having received a Scotch



diploma, he at length quitted the ministry, and applied solely to the practice of physic; that he nevertheless continued as fervent in the offices of piety as ever, and annually renewed his covenant with the Lord; yet still finding occasion, now and then, to lament the 'corruptions and indwelling lusts working in his soul,' and how much his mind was 'defiled by multitudes of sinful and unclean thoughts,' and to complain of 'the sin which did so easily beset him;' that *Fees* not coming in very fast at first, he prayed to God for a comfortable supply of patients, and that 'in kind answer to his prayers, God was pleased to procure employment for him as a physician;' that finally, the Doctor lived to the age of eighty-four,—and then experienced, that he was himself as mortal as his patients, tho' he probably out-lived most of them:—and here ends our summary of the principal events recorded in his edifying "exemplification of the power of Faith and Godliness."

I SHALL also take the liberty to subjoin a few extracts from these *interesting* memoirs, and a remark or two of the *learned* publisher.—On the last day of every year Dr. Lobb used to cast up his spiritual accounts; and in 1718 found himself greatly in arrears. Among many very curious articles, the following is given as a specimen: "Thirdly, my God, hath, in a remarkable manner, preserved me and my beast in all my journies, going out and coming in: and I have been to Dorchester, to Shaftesbury several times, four times to Otterton in Devonshire, to Bristol, Taunton, London, &c."—"Thousands of people journey daily to the same places without any accident; but Dr. Lobb says God preserved him and his beast in a *remarkable manner*. By this the Dr. certainly means, that notwithstanding he was a bad rider, and his horse given to trip, yet God preserved the beast from stumbling, and

## TO THE CRITICAL REVIEWERS.

him from breaking his neck.—On a time also he took a journey into Cornwall, and, O wonderful miracle ! returned safe home; upon which the learned publisher (Mr. Green) observes, “ and tho’ the wind was high and bleak, and in their faces as they returned, yet neither of them caught any cold.”—While he officiated as dissenting minister at Yeovil, his congregation differed much, not only about his preaching, but about their own singing, “ which tended (as the Dr. himself observes) not a little to render his ministry useless among them; and the rather because both parties, they who were for bringing in new tunes, and they who were against it, laid the blame upon him. This led him to think they might profit more by another minister than by him, to whom, says he, of late, they have shewn too little regard; and that as all circumstances were, he might very well conclude, that God in his Providence was leading him to Witham.”—A very pious and reasonable conclusion indeed; considering that he allowed *his ministry was rendered useless among them, and that they shew’d him too little regard.* The Doctor, however, had a charity for his congregation, as appears from the following part of a prayer; “ And if thou shouldst see fit to settle me at Witham, I humbly and earnestly beseech thee to provide a minister for the congregation at Yeovil.”——The Dr. tells us he was a dissenter upon principle. “ I rejoice in my being a dissenter, notwithstanding the disadvantages of it as to worldly things;” and on this he thus prays, “ O my God, I praise and thank thee for keeping me from all sinful conformities, for the sake of temporal gain.” But behold how consistent all this is with the following ! “ On reflection, I find myself most guilty of these sins; first, a *proneness to pride and ambition*; secondly, to *worldly mindedness* ;” upon which he ex-



## A L E T T E R

claims: "Oh! how fond am I of *worldly comforts*! how much grieved, and afflicted if they are *taken from me*!—Such are the whole memoirs of Theophilus Lobb, M. D. and F. R. S.—But the publisher comes not a whit behind him: for nothing can exceed the *justness* and *propriety* of the following observation; "It is not indeed to be expected, (says the judicious Mr. Green) that every one should be as *capable* as the Doctor was, of *praying* and *teaching*. But if he has not the *gift of prayer*, he may use a *form*." Heavens! a form! what condescension! what concession from a dissenting minister!—Were not these memoirs actually published, it would be scarce credible that any man was infirm enough to record such, or any friend or relation so weak as to publish them. It served, however, to keep a *certain* press and fount of letters from being totally useless.—In short, the reader, from what has been already said of this performance, must be a competent judge of its merit; and will, I am positive, join with me in asserting, that it was the duty of the Reviewers to inform the public, That the memoirs of Theophilus Lobb, published by John Green, were absurd and ridiculous, and entirely unworthy a perusal. The Monthly Reviewers\* have exposed it in a proper light: perhaps they have taken too much notice of it. But let us hear what account your HIGH MIGHTINESSES give of this publication, and see if you have *honestly*, *impartially*, and *justly* discharged your duty to the public.

---

\* Frequent report induced me to hint in the preface, that the Monthly and Critical Reviewers were the same men; but the remarks of the former on the above publication convince me to the contrary.

## TO THE CRITICAL REVIEWERS.

"THIS volume contains a minute account of the piety of the late Dr. Lobb, and his prayers on many different occasions; several of the most material occurrences of his life; the history of his man Joseph; and other particulars extracted from his diary: likewise a copy of verses on the publication of these memoirs, by Dr. Thomas Gibbons, and a list of the books which have been published by Dr. Lobb."

A VERY friendly and favourable account this! but surely, Messrs. Critics, you'll not pretend that you have *reviewed* this book! your notice of it is rather calculated to excite curiosity, and induce the public to buy it, than to ridicule, discourage, and decry such a publication: a publication, replete in every page with absurdities and inconsistencies; that abounds with nonsense, ludicrous and even profane prayers; in which Divine Providence is introduced on every trifling occasion, made the contriver of many ridiculous accidents, and represented as an intimate and familiar acquaintance. I appeal to the candid, whether this is not the case, and whether this performance ought not to be exposed, and declared utterly unworthy the perusal of a single reader?

In short, justice and impartiality should have influenced you severely to censure and condemn this performance; not only as a work highly absurd and ridiculous in itself, but a publication that contains not a single literary merit.—But I will discover the secret spring of your conduct. I accused you, in my preface, of an unjust friendship and partiality for one Toft, an obscure bookseller in Essex. You have evinced this to a demonstration; for John Green, the learned publisher of the above memoirs, is father-in-law to Toft, and Master Dickey Lobb, nearly related to the famous Theophilus Lobb, is Toft's partner.



A L E T T E R, &c.

If you think me *worth more powder and shot* (to use one of your general and favourite expressions) let me again advise you to throw by *ipse dixit* weapons: don't tell me that I am *petulant, arrogant, or a fool*, but prove me so. Attack me with some of your weighty metal, or I shall henceforth deem you the most poultry antagonists I ever engaged with.

I am,

With all charitable concern for your sinking character,

Yours,

ROBERT HOULTON.

P.S. If you could advise your friend Toft to employ his press to a better purpose than that of printing *Billingsgate songs*; or shew him a more likely way of getting money than by *consulting lawyers* whether they can prosecute authors for publishing the truth, you will do him far more essential service, than by posting his name in your Review.

